1st November 1932]

Legality of the double conviction and sentence passed on Mr. S. Satyamurti.

* 257 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any opinion on the illegality of the double conviction and sentence of Mr. S. Satyamurti from an eminent advocate of Madras;

(*b*) whether the Madras Advocates' Association has sent any representation on the same question to the Government; and

(*c*) whether the Government have obtained the opinion of the Advocate-General on the same?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) No.

Alleged Hindu Muslim tension in Nandyal.

* 258 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether a new mosque was constructed in Nandyal by Mr. Syed Chinna Manna Sahib in or about 1930 and whether as late as October and December 1931 and the beginning of March 1932 the Hindu Dasara and Vaikunta Ekadasi processions, etc., passed the mosque in question with music without any protest or objection by any one;

(*b*) whether Mr. Gawne who was the District Collector of Kurnool, and Mr. Colebrook who was the District Superintendent of Police, Kurnool district, handed over charge of their respective offices on 28th February 1932 and 11th March 1932 respectively and whether during their regime there were any Hindu-Moslem troubles in Nandyal;

(*c*) the names of the Collectors and the District Superintendents of Police, who have held and are holding office in the district after Messrs. Gawne and Colebrook left, and the periods for which they held or the dates from which they are holding their office; and

(*d*) whether after the departure of Messrs. Gawne and Colebrook from the Kurnool district there have been Hindu-Moslem troubles in Nandyal and if so, the nature of those troubles and the reasons for them?

A.—(*a*) & (*d*) There is a mosque in Nandyal called Chinna Manna Sahib's mosque. The exact date of its construction is not known. It is reported that some difficulty arose between the Muhammadans and Hindus about the playing of music in front of the mosque in February 1932. On the night of the 4th March, an arrangement was made to let the Sivarathri procession pass with music after 9 p.m. when there is usually no prayer. There was, however, stone-throwing, probably by some Muhammadans who felt that the Hindus were lingering longer near the

[1st November 1932

mosque than was necessary. In connexion with Hindu processions proposed to be held on the 21st March an order under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed by the Sub-Collector prohibiting the Hindus from taking processions with music. The same thing happened on the 6th April 1932, the Telugu New Year's day, when another order under Section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, was passed. No trouble has been reported since.

(*b*) Mr. Gawne handed over charge on the 1st March 1932 and Mr. Colebrook on 19th March 1932. It is reported that the trouble began as early as February 1932.

(*c*) The information is given in the statement below:—

Name of officer.	Date on which he took charge.	Date on which he handed over charge.
Collectors.		
1. Mr. V. S. Hejmadi, I.C.S.	1st March 1932 afternoon.	16th July 1932 afternoon.
2. Mr. E. B. Cobbald, I.C.S.	16th July 1932 afternoon.	..
District Superintendents of Police.		
1. Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Central Range, was in additional charge.	20th March 1932.	9th April 1932.
2. Mr. W. H. Wright	10th April 1932.	17th May 1932.
3. Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Central Range, was in additional charge.	18th May 1932.	1st June 1932.
4. Mr. V. K. Rajagopala Thamban ..	2nd June 1932.	..

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the Government are aware that very recently a procession was allowed to pass without any disturbance under the supervision of the present Collector?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"It was allowed to pass. There was some disturbance though not of a serious nature."

Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—"Was it allowed to pass the mosque at the time of the prayer?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"The District Magistrate took care to see that the procession did not pass at the time of the prayer."

Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—"The answer says that the procession was allowed to pass some time after 9 p.m. Is that practice still in force?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I do not know whether it is still in force, but the District Magistrate has ordered that the procession should not pass at the time when the actual service is conducted in the mosque."

1st November 1932]

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I ask whether the Government think that there is any specified time for prayers in the mosque? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " There are five times every day when prayers are conducted in a mosque. The congregation generally know at what time they have to go to the mosque."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I ask whether the Government think that prayers are prohibited in the mosque at other times? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " Prayers are not prohibited at other times, but the recognized service takes place only at a particular time."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" At the same time, are the Government aware that people continue to say their prayers in the mosque at all hours of the day and even till late in the night? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " One or two people are always there saying their prayers, but the recognized service takes place only at a particular time."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Are the common rights of way such as going in a procession with music along the public streets interfered with only for the sake of old mosque which have been existing for a long time, or are they to be interfered with for the sake of any mosques that have recently come or may come into existence hereafter? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " I think these questions are considered on their merits as they arise."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I ask whether the Government are aware that this mosque is not a very old mosque? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " I am prepared to take the information from the hon. Member."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Two years."

Order, dated 3rd June 1932, under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, issued by the Sub-Magistrate of Jayankondasolapuram, Trichinopoly district.

* 259-A *Q.*—Mr. V. T. ARASU : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Sub-Magistrate of Jayankondasolapuram in Trichinopoly district has issued on the 3rd June 1932 an order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code, prohibiting any kind of meetings and demonstrations in about eleven villages of the Udaiyarpalaiyam zamindari, for a period of two months; and

(*b*) the reason or reasons which prompted the Magistrate to issue that order?